DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 391 344 EC 304 593

AUTHOR Belcastro, Frank P.
TITLE Richardson Study: Characteristics of Five Gifted Programs in Iowa.
PUB DATE [29 Dec 95]
NOTE 34p.; For the original 1985 Richardson study, see ED 266 567. For the 1993 Iowa Study, see ED 385 960.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academically Gifted; *Delivery Systems; Educational Change; Educational Needs; *Educational Practices; Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; Followup Studies; Independent Study; Itinerant Teachers; Mentors; Resource Room Programs; Science Education; *Special Classes; Special Programs; State Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Iowa; *Richardson Study

ABSTRACT

This study was a follow-up to a 1993 study which surveyed Iowa school districts to compare types of programs for gifted students in Iowa with the 16 types found in a 1985 national survey (the Richardson study). The present study examined the five program types which the 1993 study identified as having a large number of characteristics significantly different from expectation, given the proportion of results. Significant characteristics of the following five program types are identified: (1) part-time special program; (2) independent study gifted program; (3) itinerant teacher gifted program; (4) mentorship gifted program; and (5) full-time special class gifted program. Characteristics that the programs shared are identified and recommendations offered. The paper concludes that: these five program types as used by Iowa schools fall short of principles of excellence; the part-time special class (pull-out program) should be replaced with the full-time special class; a version of the full-time special class should be provided for intellectually above-average students; and modular programs and supplementary materials should be used in teaching science to K-8 gifted students. The survey questionnaire is appended. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 391 344

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

RICHARDSON STUDY: CHARACTERISTICS OF FIVE GIFTED PROGRAMS IN IOWA

Frank P. Belcastro

University of Dubuque

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. Belcastro

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC304593

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

A national survey of public and parochial school districts was conducted (Richardson Study) which provided a profile of the current status of educational practices for gifted students. Using the national questionnaire, a similar survey of Iowa school districts was conducted in 1993. Reported were the results of the survey which showed that five of the 16 gifted program types had large numbers of characteristics which were significantly different from the expectation, given the proportion of the results. The chi-square statistic was the tool of comparison. Results indicated that although the five program types shared certain characteristics, the observed per cents of these characteristics were low--less than 50% in almost all cases. Recommendations were made.

RICHARDSON STUDY: CHARACTERISTICS OF FIVE GIFTED PROGRAMS IN IOWA

The Richardson Study provides a profile of the current educational practices for gifted students throughout the United States and details which programs are most effective. It has attracted national attention because it is the most comprehensive report to date on national practices in educating gifted students since the Marland Report of 1972 (Cox, Daniel, & Boston, 1985; Daniel, 1989). The purpose of the follow-up Pyramid Project was to assist four school districts in implementing the recommendations of the Richardson Study. The Project's most distinguishing feature was its comprehensiveness (Cox & Gluck, 1989).

The study gathered information on 16 program types which constitute practices or approaches which are appropriate for gifted students. The program types are:

1. Enrichment in the Regular Classroom
2. Part-Time Special Class
3. Full-Time Special Class
4. Independent Study
9. Early Entrance
10. Continuous Progress
11. Nongraded School
12. Moderate Acceleration
13. Radical Acceleration

5. Itinerant Teacher
6. Mentorship
7. Resource Rooms
8. Special Schools
14. College Board and Advanced Placement
15. Fast-Paced Courses
16. Concurrent or Dual Enrollment

During the spring of 1993 the national questionnaire (see Appendix A) was sent to the 431 public school districts in Iowa. Two hundred seventy three or 63% of the school districts responded. The existences of these program types in Iowa and the differences in responses between Iowa and the nation were determined and reported in another study (Belcastro, 1995).

However, of the 16 different program types, there were five of them each of which had a large number of characteristics which were significantly different from the expectation, given the proportion of results. The purpose of this study is to report on the significant characteristics of these five programs. Many of the observed characteristics of the schools were no different than the matching expected characteristics, given the proportion in each category; the results reported in this study are only those where the observed characteristics of the schools were significantly more or significantly less than expected.

Statistical Procedure

The chi-square statistic was used to determine the relationships between selected sets of two categories or characteristics of gifted programs in Iowa schools.

The Five Iowa Programs

Part-Time Special Program

In this program, the gifted student is with a heterogeneous class part of the time but is with students of similar ability part of the time. At the elementary level, this provision might be described as a "pull-out" program; on the secondary level it would include honors classes.

1. Of those schools using the part-time special program, significantly more of them (87% vs. 84%) used I.Q. as a procedure in identifying students for their gifted programs than expected.
2. Of those schools using the part-time special program, significantly more of them (85.3% vs. 84.5%) used teacher nomination as a procedure in identifying students for their gifted programs than expected.
3. Of those schools using the part-time special program, significantly more of them (93.5% vs. 84.4%) had special requirements for teachers in their gifted programs than expected.
4. Of those schools using the part-time special

program, significantly more of them (86% vs. 85.3%) used the library as a resource for their gifted programs than expected.

5. Of those schools using the part-time special program, significantly less of them (85.3% vs. 92.4%) used resources other than the library, museum, industry, government agency, or mentors in their gifted programs than expected.

6. Of those schools using the part-time special program, significantly more of them (87.4% vs. 84.8%) had goals for gifted students written at the district level rather than at the building level than expected.

7. Of those schools using the part-time special program, significantly less of them (61.1% vs. 85%) had no goals at all for gifted students at any level, district or building, than expected.

8. Of those schools using the part-time special program, significantly less of them (75.5% vs. 84.9%) had no advisory group for their gifted programs than expected.

9. Of those schools using the part-time special program, significantly more of them (89.9% vs. 84.6%) had special procedures established for evaluating gifted programs at the district level as opposed to the building level than expected.

10. Of those schools using the part-time special

program, significantly less of them (67% vs. 84.6%) had no special procedure established for evaluating gifted programs at either the district or building levels than expected.

Independent Study Gifted Program

In this program a student chooses certain areas for investigation and assumes a high degree of responsibility for meeting objectives.

1. Of those schools using the independent study program, significantly more of them (57.4% vs. 46.4%) had special requirements for teachers in their gifted program than expected.

2. Of those schools using the independent study program, significantly more of them (avg. 57.5% vs. 47.5%) used museums, industries, government agencies, and mentors as resources for their gifted programs than expected.

3. Of those schools using the independent study program, significantly less of them (22.2% vs. 46.1%) had no goals at all either the district or building levels for their gifted programs than expected.

4. Of those schools using the independent study program, significantly more of them (avg. 57.1% vs. 45.5%) included students, parents, teachers, and others in their advisory groups for their gifted programs than expected.

5. Of those schools using the independent study program, significantly less of them (30.2% vs. 45.5%) had no advisory groups for their gifted programs than expected.

6. Of those schools using the independent study program, significantly more of them (52.1% vs. 46%) had special procedures established for evaluating their gifted programs at the district level as opposed to the building level than expected.

7. Of those schools using the independent study program, significantly less of them (12.5% vs. 45.8%) had no special procedures either at the district or building levels for evaluating their gifted programs than expected.

Itinerant Teacher Gifted Program

A teacher with special skills in gifted education teaches gifted students in more than one school on a regular basis.

1. Of those schools using the itinerant teacher gifted program, significantly more of them (49.1% vs. 36.2%) used other than I.Q. tests, achievement tests, grades, teacher nomination or peer nomination in identifying students for gifted programs than expected.

2. Of those schools using the itinerant teacher gifted program, significantly more of them (50.9% vs. 35.7%)

had special requirements for teachers in their gifted programs than expected.

3. Of those schools using the itinerant teacher gifted program, significantly more of them (43.6% vs. 35.8%) had teachers in gifted programs participate in inservice training on a regular basis than expected.

4. Of those schools using the itinerant teacher gifted program, significantly more of them (64% vs. 35.8%) had other than teachers, counselors, and administrators participate in inservice training on a regular basis for their gifted programs than expected.

5. Of those schools using the itinerant teacher gifted program, significantly more of them (39.9% vs. 35.6%) had a staff member at the supervisory or administrative level responsible for their gifted programs than expected.

6. Of those schools using the itinerant teacher gifted program, significantly more of them (avg. 49.6% vs. 37.8%) used museums, industries, and mentors as resources in their gifted programs than expected.

7. Of those schools using the itinerant teacher gifted program, significantly more of them (39.4% vs. 36.6%) had a district-written philosophy for educating gifted students in their gifted programs than expected.

8. Of those schools using the itinerant teacher gifted program, significantly more of them (43% vs. 36.7%), had

goals for gifted students written at the district level as opposed to the building level for their gifted programs than expected.

9. Of those schools using the itinerant teacher gifted program, significantly less of them (11% vs. 36.7%) had no goals at all for their gifted programs at any level, district or building, than expected.

10. Of those schools using the itinerant teacher gifted program, significantly more of them (41.3% vs. 36.3%) had administrators as members of an advisory group for their gifted programs than expected.

11. Of those schools using the itinerant teacher gifted program, significantly more of them (45.2% vs. 36.4%) had special procedures established for evaluating their gifted programs at the district level as opposed to the building level than expected.

Mentorship Gifted Program

Mentorship is a program which assigns gifted students to work or study with adults who have special knowledge or skills in the student's area of interest.

1. Of those schools using the mentorship gifted program, significantly more of them (32% vs. 22.5%) had peer nomination as a procedure in identifying students for their gifted programs than expected.

2. Of those schools using the mentorship gifted program, significantly more of them (31% vs. 22.4%) had

other than I.Q. tests, achievement tests, grades, and teacher nomination as a procedure for identifying students for their gifted programs than expected.

3. Of those schools using the mentorship gifted program, significantly more of them (33.3% vs. 22%) had special requirements for teachers in their gifted programs than expected.

4. Of those schools using the mentorship gifted program, significantly more of them (28.2% vs. 22.4%) had teachers in gifted programs participate in inservice training on a regular basis than expected.

5. Of those schools using the mentorship gifted program, significantly more of them (25.3% vs. 21.5%) had a staff member at the supervisory or administrative level responsible for their gifted program than expected.

6. Of those schools using the mentorship gifted program, significantly more of them (avg. 34.48% vs. 23.5%) used museums, industries, government agencies, and mentors in their gifted programs than expected.

7. Of those schools using the mentorship gifted program, significantly more of them (26.1% vs. 22.9%) had goals for the gifted students written at the district level as opposed to the building level for their gifted programs than expected.

8. Of those schools using the mentorship gifted

program, significantly more of them (42.3% vs. 22.3%) had other persons in addition to students, parents, teachers, and administrators on an advisory group for their gifted programs than expected. Because this program involves mentors outside of the school in order to provide as diverse an interaction with experts as possible, it is desirable that the advisory group would involve these mentors.

9. Of those schools using the mentorship gifted program, significantly more of them (29.8% vs. 22.4%) had established special procedures for evaluating their gifted programs at the district level as opposed to the building level than expected.

10. Of those schools using the mentorship gifted program, significantly less of them (14.7% vs. 22.4%) had established special procedures for evaluating their gifted programs at the building level as opposed to the district level than expected.

11. Of those schools using the mentorship gifted program, significantly less of them (4.2% vs. 22.4%) had no special procedures for evaluating their gifted programs than expected.

Full-Time Special Class Gifted Program

At the elementary level, this would most likely be a self-contained classroom of high-ability students or possibly a departmentalized classroom of such students.

1. Of those schools using the full-time special class gifted program, significantly more of them (32.4% vs. 20.1%) had special requirements for the teachers in their gifted programs than expected.

2. Of those schools using the full-time special class gifted program, significantly more of them (23.6% vs. 20.3%) had a staff member at the supervisory or administrative level responsible for their gifted program than expected.

3. Of those schools using the full-time special class gifted program, significantly more of them (avg. 27.6% vs. 20.1%) used museums and industries as resources in their gifted programs than expected.

4. Of those schools using the full-time special class gifted program, significantly more of them (23.2% vs. 20.4%) had goals for their gifted students written at the district level as opposed to the building level than expected.

5. Of those schools using the full-time special class gifted program, significantly more of them (23.9% vs. 20.2%) had established special procedures for evaluating their gifted programs than expected.

Shared Characteristics

1. A characteristic shared by all five of these programs is that significantly more of the schools using them (avg. 53.5% vs. avg. 41.7%) had special

requirements for teachers in their gifted programs than expected.

2. A characteristic shared by all five programs is that significantly more of the schools using them (avg. 51.0% vs. avg. 42.8%) used one or more of the following resources in their programs: library, museum, industry, government agency, mentor.

3. A characteristic shared by all five programs is that significantly more of the schools using them (avg. 48.2% vs. avg. 41.9%) had special procedures established for evaluating gifted programs at the district level as opposed to the building level than expected.

4. A characteristic shared by four of the five programs (except independent study) is that significantly more of the schools using them (avg. 44.9% vs. avg. 41.2%) had goals for gifted students written at the district level rather than at the building level than expected.

5. A characteristic shared by three of the five programs (independent study, itinerant teacher, mentorship) is that significantly more of the schools using them (avg. 46.8% vs. avg. 34.7%) included one or more of the following in their advisory groups for their gifted programs than expected: students, parents, teachers, administrators, others.

6. A characteristic shared by three of the five programs (itinerant teacher, mentorship, full-time special class) is that significantly more of the schools using them (avg. 29.6% vs. avg. 25.8%) had a staff member at the supervisory level responsible for their gifted programs than expected.

Recommendations

1. Except for the part-time special class gifted program, the per cents of schools having the observed characteristics listed were disappointingly low; while the observed per cent of schools having certain characteristics was significantly higher than the expected per cent of schools having matching characteristics, the observed per cents in each case were almost always lower than 50%. For example, 39.4% of the schools using the itinerant teacher gifted program had a district-written philosophy for educating gifted students in their gifted program. While this is significantly larger than expected, it means that 60.6% of them do not have such a district-written philosophy for educating gifted students in their gifted program. One wonders how a district can operate efficiently without a written philosophy to guide it. It is recommended that the Iowa Department of Education make all attempts to increase the number of schools in those areas where the per cents are low.

2. Even though Iowa schools scored significantly higher in observed characteristics than expected in these five gifted programs, the absolute per cents were low. Specifically, it is recommended that those deficient Iowa schools using these five gifted programs:

a. have special requirements for teachers in their gifted programs;

b. use museums, industries, government agencies, libraries, and other resources in their gifted programs;

c. include students, parents, teachers, administrators, and others in their advisory groups for their gifted programs;

d. establish special procedures for evaluating their gifted programs at the district level as opposed to the building level;

e. use I. Q. tests, achievement tests, grades, teacher nomination, peer nomination, and other procedures in identifying students for their gifted programs;

f. provide inservice training on a regular basis for teachers in gifted programs, counselors, and administrators and require them to participate;

g. assign a staff member at the supervisory or administrative level to be responsible for the gifted programs;

h. create a district-written philosophy for educating gifted students in their gifted programs;

i. create goals for gifted students written at the district level rather than the building level for the gifted programs;

j. increase special funding available for gifted students at the local level and encourage the state legislature to allot gifted students the same amount of funding that it makes available to handicapped students.

Conclusions

1. The per cents of Iowa schools having the characteristics in the five gifted programs are low. These five programs as used by the Iowa schools fall short of principles of excellence and need improvement.

2. The part-time special class (pull-out program) should be abandoned even though approximately 95% of all gifted programs employ it at the upper elementary grade levels (Oglesby & Gallagher, 1983). It is an administratively expedient program which has many disadvantages (Belcastro, 1987).

3. The part-time special class gifted program should be replaced with the full-time special class gifted program. Being a part of the regular curriculum, the full-time special class students would meet most of

every day for academic subjects but would be mainstreamed with regular students for non-academic activities. The daily class schedule would be extremely flexible, there would be a variety of delivery systems, pacing would match the learning rate of its gifted students, and the subject matter would challenge students by its complexity and high levels of abstraction requiring students to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate.

4. A version of the full-time special class for should be provided for intellectually above-average students. They deserve such a program of their own and should not be included in a similar program for the gifted. The combining of gifted and intellectually above-average students in the same class harms both groups; it either inhibits the full development of the intellectually gifted students because the above-average students hold them back or it moves too fast for the intellectually above-average students making for incomplete comprehension.

5. One-size-fits all schooling should be just as unacceptable as one-size-fits-all clothing. Under one-size clothing, the rich would hire their own tailors; under one-size schooling, the rich would enroll their children in private schools. The true victims of schools without flexible programs to meet the needs of

its intellectually-varied students are the gifted children of the economically and social disadvantaged.

6. Use modular programs and supplementary materials in teaching science to K - 8 gifted students. Research has shown that existing basal textbooks fail to meet new science curriculum standards for all students but particularly for gifted students (Johnson, Boyce & Van Tassel-Baska, 1995).

References

Belcastro, F. (1987). Elementary pull-out programs for the intellectually gifted--boon or bane? Roeper Review, 9, 208-212.

Belcastro, F. (1995). Richardson study: U.S. vs. Iowa. (Will appear in January, 1996 issue of ERIC). Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ 304138).

Cox, J., Daniel, N., & Boston, B. O. (1985). Educating able learners: Programs and promising practices. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Cox, J., & Gluck, D. (1989). The Richardson study and the pyramid project. G/C/T, 12, 44-46.

Daniel, N. (1989). Out of the Richardson study: A look at flexible pacing. G/C/T, 12, 48-52.

Johnson, D., Boyce, L., & Van Tassel-Baska, J. (1995). Science curriculum review: Evaluating materials for high-ability learners. Gifted Child Quarterly, 39, 36-42.

Marland, S. (1972). Education of the gifted and talented. Report to the Subcommittee on Education, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Washington, DC: U. S. Senate.

Oglesby, K., & Gallagher, J. (1983). Teacher-pupil ratios, instructional time, and expenditure estimates for three administrative strategies for educating gifted students. Gifted Child Quarterly, 27, 57-63.

Pagano, R. (1994). Understanding statistics in the behavioral sciences (4th ed.). Minneapolis, MN: West.

Appendix A

THE RICHARDSON STUDY

IOWA QUESTIONNAIRE

The Sid Richardson Foundation in Fort Worth, Texas, is continuing its national study of elementary and secondary programs for gifted students. We are collecting data on programs that are identified as special programs for the gifted and also on other provisions for the most able and talented students which may not be identified as "Gifted Programs."

This questionnaire, though rather lengthy, should require only a few minutes of your time since not all of it will be applicable to any one district. You will notice that the programs are identified by a Roman numeral in the margin and that they are separated by double lines. We request that you complete the General Information section at the beginning and any other sections which apply to your district. The results of the study will be available state-wide to all who are concerned with this important issue.

An addressed envelope, requiring no postage, is enclosed for your convenience.

GENERAL INFORMATION

School District_____
Name of District

Name of person completing questionnaire_____

Person's title_____ Telephone No._____

Address_____
Street

_____
City State Zip

A. What is the total population of the area served by your school district?

____(1) Less than 50,000 ____(2) 50,000-100,000 ____(3) 100,001-200,000
____(4) 200,001-300,000 ____(5) 300,001-400,000 ____(6) 400,001-500,000
____(7) More than 500,000

B. Please list the number of certified staff members in your district.

____(1)

C. What percentage of teachers have as their highest degree:

____(1) B.S., B.A. ____(2) M.S., M.A., M.Ed. ____(3) Ph.D., D.Ed.

D. Is the school: ____(1) Public ____(2) Private
____(3) Parochial ____(4) Other. Please specify._____

_____

E. Is the student population:

____(1) All male ____(2) All female ____(3) Co-educational

F. Please list the number of students enrolled in:

____(1) Pre-School ____(2) Elementary (Inc. K.)

____(3) Middle/Junior High ____(4) Senior High

G. The student ethnic ration is:

____(1) % Anglo ____(2) % Black ____(3) % Hispanic

____(4) % Asian ____(5) % Native American

____(6) Other. Please specify._____

H. What percentage of students receive free or reduced-priced lunch?

____(1) None ____(2) List the percentage who do.

I. Check the procedures included in identifying students for special programs or provisions for gifted students.

____(1) None ____(2) I.Q. tests ____(3) Achievement tests

____(4) Grades ____(5) Teacher nomination ____(4) Peer nomination

____(7) Other. Please specify._____

J. Are there special requirements for teachers in these programs?

____(1) No ____(2) Yes. Please specify._____

_____

K. The following staff members participate in inservice training on a regular basis:

____(1) None ____(2) Teachers in gifted/talented programs

____(3) All teachers ____(4) Counselors ____(5) Administrators

____(6) Other. Please specify._____

L. Is a staff member at the supervisory ot administrative level responsible for the gifted program?

____(1) Yes. Specify title._____ ____(2) No

M. Check the following resources your program uses.

____(1) Library ____(2) Museum ____(3) Industry ____(4) Government agency

____(5) Mentors ____(6) Others. Please specify._____

_____

N. Does the district have a written philosophy for educating gifted students?

____(1) Yes ____(2) No

O. Goals for gifted/talented students are written:

____(1) For the district level ____(2) For the building level ____(3) Not at all

P. An advisory group for the gifted/talented program includes:

____(1) Students ____(2) Parents ____(3) Teachers ____(4) Administrators

____(5) Others. Please specify._____ ____(6) Does not exist

Q. Special procedures for evaluating the gifted/talented program are established:

____(1) At the district level ____(2)At the building level ____(3) Neither

R. What is the per pupil expenditure in your district?

____(1) Less than $1,500 ____(2) $1,500-$2,000 ____(3) $2,001-$2,500
____(4) $2,501-$3,000 ____(5) $3,001-$3,500 ____(6) $3,501-$4,000
____(7) $4,001-$4,500 ____(8) $4,501-$5,000 ____(9) More than $5,000

S. Are special additional budgetary provisions made for gifted/talented students?

____(1) Yes ____(2) No

T. If special funding is available for gifted/talented, check any of the following sources which apply:

____(1) State ____(2) Local ____(3) Federal ____(4) Private
____(5) Other. Please specify._____

U. Please list the program or school in your district which you recommend for a visit from an outside observer.

Name of school_____

Address_____
Street

_____
City State Zip

Person to contact_____Position_____

Telephone No._____ / _____
AC

I. ENRICHMENT IN THE REGULAR CLASSROOM. The teacher with or without special assistance, provides enrichment activities for gifted students in a heterogeneous classroom. We include individualized instruction in this category.

V. How many students participate in the enrichment activities?

____(1) All of the class ____(2) Those identified as gifted/talented
____(3) Those identified as gifted/talented plus others, but not including the entire class.

W. How much time is allotted to enrichment activities per week?

____(1) Less than 3 hours ____(2) 3-5 hours ____(3) More than 5 hours

X. Which content areas are enriched?

____(1) Math ____(2) Science ____(3) English/
____(4) Social Studies ____(5) Multidisciplinary Language Arts
____(6) Other. Please specify._____

Y. The curricular materials used in the enrichment activities are:

____(1) The same as those used in the basic program.
____(2) Different from those used in the basic program.

Z. What strategies are used in the enrichment activities?

____(1) Group instruction ____(2) Individual instruction
____(3) Special projects ____(4) Puzzles and games
____(5) Other. Please specify._____

II. PART-TIME SPECIAL CLASS. The gifted student is with a heterogeneous class part of the time but is with students of similar ability part of the time. At the elementary level, this provision might be described as a "pull-out" program; on the secondary level it would include honors classes. Resource rooms are considered later as a separate category.

AA. How many days per week does the special class meet?

____(1) 1 day per week ____(2) 2-4 days per week ____(3) 5 days per week

BB. What is the length of each class session?

____(1) Less than 1 hour ____(2) 1-2 hours ____(3) More than 2 hours

CC. Which content areas are studied in the special class?

____(1) Math ____(2) Science ____(3) English/ Language Arts
____(4) Social Studies ____(5) Multidisciplinary
____(6) Other. Please specify._____

DD. What strategies are used in the special class?

____(1) Group instruction ____(2) Individual instruction
____(3) Special projects ____(4) Puzzles and games
____(5) Other. Please specify._____

EE. Do the regular classroom teacher and the special class teacher co-ordinate their curricular plans:

____(1) Regularly ____(2) Occasionally ____(3) Not at all

FF. Is a student required to make up work covered in the regular classroom during his/her absence?

____(1) Yes ____(2) No

III. FULL-TIME SPECIAL CLASS. At the elementary level, this might be a self contained or departmentalized classroom of high-ability students. At the secondary level, this might be a single course in which the student's curriculum in enriched and accelerated. See XV for situations where two or more classes are integrated and fast-paced.

GG. Which content areas are studied in the special class?

____(1) Math ____(2) Science ____(3) English/ Language Arts
____(4) Social Studies ____(5) Multidisciplinary
____(6) Other. Please specify._____

HH. Are the curricular materials the same as those studied in regular classes?

____(1) Yes ____(2) No

II. How are students assigned to special classes?
____(1) Specific selection criteria ____(2) Self-selection

JJ. Is the amount of curricular material covered:
____(1) About the same as in the regular classes ____(2) Greater than in the regular classes

---

IV. INDEPENDENT STUDY. A student chooses certain areas for investigation and assumes a high degree of responsibility for meeting objectives.

KK. How much time is allotted to independent studies per week?
____(1) Less than 3 hours ____(2) 3-5 hours ____(3) More than 5 hours

LL. In which content areas do students engage in independent study?
____(1) Math ____(2) Science ____(3) English/
____(4) Social Studies ____(5) Multidisciplinary Language Arts
____(6) Other. Please specify._____

MM. What resources do the students use in indpendent study?
____(1) Staff ____(2) Library ____(3) Community ____(4) Laboratory
____(5) Other. Please specify._____

NN. How is a student's independent study progress evaluated?
____(1) Self ____(2) Teacher
____(3) Other. Please specify._____

V. ITINERANT TEACHER. A teacher with special skills in gifted education teaches gifted students in more than one school on a regular basis.

OO. How many schools do itinerant teachers serve?
____(1) Less than 5 ____(2) 5-10 ____(3) More than 10

PP. Do itinerant teachers teach in:
____(1) The regular classroom teacher's room
____(2) A permanent classroom assigned for the purpose
____(3) In a variety of settings

QQ. Do the regular classroom teacher and the itinerant teacher co-ordinate their curricular plans?
____(1) Regularly ____(2) Occasionally ____(3) Not at all

RR. What is the average number of miles driven by an itinerant teacher per week, exclusive of the distance to and from the home?
____(1) Less than 50 miles ____(2) 50-100 miles ____(3) More than 100 miles

---

VI. MENTORSHIPS. We define mentorships as a program which assigns gifted students to work or study with adults who have special knowledge or skills in the students' areas of interest. We include the High School Executive Internship Program in this category.

SS. How much school time is allotted to a student to work with a mentor?
____(1) None; it is an out of school program ____(2) Less than 3 hours per week
____(3) 3-5 hours per week ____(4) More than five hours per week

TT. Is Carnegie credit awarded for work with mentors?
____(1) Yes ____(2) No ____(3) Sometimes

UU. How are mentors selected?
____(1) On a voluntary basis ____(2) Specific criteria ____(3) Recommendations

VV. Who are the mentors?
____(1) School staff ____(2) University faculty
____(3) Business and professional people ____(4) Other. Please specify._____

WW. Do mentors receive special training?
____(1) Yes ____(2) No

XX. Are mentors paid?
____(1) Yes ____(2) No

VII. RESOURCE ROOMS. This might be a corner of the library or an entire room where gifted students go individually or in groups to explore special areas of study.

YY. How much time per week does a student spend in a resource room?
____(2) Less than 3 hours ____(3) 3-5 hours ____(4) More than 5 hours

ZZ. Time scheduled in the resource room is:
____(1) The same each week ____(2) Varied from week to week

AAA. Who is in charge of the resource room?
____(1) Special teacher of the gifted ____(2) Librarian
____(3) Aide ____(4) Parent ____(5) Community Volunteers

BBB. What materials are available in the resource room?
____(1) Books ____(2) Films ____(3) Packets
____(4) Other. Please specify._____

CCC. What equipment is available in the resource room?
____(1) Labarotory equipment ____(2) Shop tools
____(3) Other. Please specify._____

DDD. Where is the resource room located?

____(1) In a separate room ____(2) In the library

____(3) Other. Please specify._____

VIII. SPECIAL SCHOOLS. These include magnet schools which focus on a single discipline as well as those which include the entire spectrum. Also included are residential schools for the gifted.

EEE. The special school is:

____(1) Residential ____(2) Non-residential

FFF. The special school has a:

____(1) General curriculum

____(2) Special area of concentration. Please specify_____

GGG. Is the school considered a magnet school?

____(1) Yes ____(2) No

HHH. How are the students selected?

____(1) Self-selected ____(2) Specific criteria

III. Is the school considered a school for gifted students?

____(1) Yes ____(2) No

JJJ. Do the students pay tuition?

____(1) Yes ____(2) No

KKK. How long has the school been in existence?

____(1) Less than 5 years ____(2) 5-10 years ___(3) More than 10 years

---

IX. EARLY ENTRANCE. We define early entrance as a policy allowing students to enter a school earlier than the normal age for that district.

LLL. At what level(s) is the provision for early entrance made?

____(1) Kindergarten ____(2) First grade

____(3) Middle/Junior High School ____(4) Senior High School

MMM. How many students entered these levels last year due to early entrance policy? List the numbers please.

____(1) Kindergarten ____(2) First grade

____(3) Middle/Junior High School ____(4) Senior High School

NNN. On what basis were early assignments made? Check all that apply.

____(1) Ability test ____(2) Achievement test
____(2) Teacher recommendation ____(4) Parental request
____(5) Other. Please specify._____

OOO. Of the number accepted last year as early entrants, how many continued for at least one full year? List numbers at the appropriate levels please.

____(1) Kindergarten ____(2) First grade
____(3) Middle/Junior High School ____(4) Senior High School

PPP. Last year how many students left high school prior to graduation to enter college or university?

____(1) None ____(2) List the number, please

QQQ. How long has the early-entrance policy existed in your district?

____(1) Less than 5 years ____(2) 5-10 years ____(3) More than 10 years

---

X. CONTINUOUS PROGRESS. We define continuous progress as a provision for students to progress through the curriculum of one or more subject areas as the required skills are mastered.

RRR. At which level(s) is continuous progress in operation?

____(1) Pre-School ____(2) Elementary (Inc. K)
____(3) Middle/Junior High School ____(4) Senior High School

SSS. In what content areas does continuous progress allow students to advance at their own pace?

____(1) Math ____(2) Science ____(3) Social Studies
____(4) Language Arts (Inc. Reading) ____(5) English
____(6) Foreign Language ____(7) Other. Please specify._____

TTT. On what basis does a student move from one level to another?

____(1) Standardized tests ____(2) Teacher made tests
____(3) Demonstrated competency ____(4) Other. Please specify._____

UUU. What percentage of students are functioning above grade level in one or more content areas this year?

____(1) Less than 5% ____(2) 5-10% ____(3) 11-20% ____(4) More than 20%

VVV. How would you describe the continuous progress program?

____(1) Group instruction ____(2) Individual instruction
____(3) Other. Please specify._____

WWW. How long has the continuous progress program been in operation?

____(1) Less than 5 years ____(2) 5-10 years ____(3) More than 10 years

---

XI. NONGRADED SCHOOL. We define a nongraded school as one in which the usual labels, such as first grade, have been removed, and students progress at their own pace. Thus, one child might complete what is normally covered in one grade in less than the usual amount of time, and another child might require more than the usual amount of time to gain the skills generally acquired in one year in a graded school system.

XXX. At what level(s) is your district nongraded?

____(1) Pre-School ____(2) Elementary (Inc. K)
____(3) Middle/Junior High School ____(4) Senior High School

YYY. Do some students complete the level(s) checked in fewer years than is normally required?

____(1) Yes ____(2) No

ZZZ. If you answered "Yes" how many students:

____(1) Received additional enrichment only
____(2) Were offered curricula from the next higher level but did not leave the first school
____(3) Moved on to the next higher school

AAAA. How long has your district been nongraded?

____(1) Less than 5 years ____(2) 5-10 years ____(3) More than 10 years

---

XII. MODERATE ACCELERATION. We define moderate acceleration as any kind of provision which allows a student to complete the grades K-12 in less than thirteen years but more than ten.

BBBB. How many students were in last year's graduating class?

____(1) Less than 100 ____(2) 100-500 ____(3) More than 500

CCCC. Of this number, how many spent fewer than 13 years but more than 10 in grade K-12?

____(1) Less than 2% ____(2) 2-5% ____(3) More than 5%

DDDD. How long has your school had a policy which allowed or encouraged moderate acceleration?

____(1) Less than 2 years ____(2) 2-5 years ____(3) More than 5 years

---

XIII. RADICAL ACCELERATION. We define radical acceleration as any kind of provision which allows a student to complete grades K-12 in fewer than 11 years.

EEEE. How many students were in last year's graduating class?

____(1) Less than 100 ____(2) 100-500 ____(3) More than 500

FFFF. Of this number, how many spent fewer than 11 years in grade K-12?

____(1) Less than 1% ____(2) 1-2% ____(3) More than 2%

DDDD. How long has your school had a policy which allowed or encouraged radical acceleration?

____(1) Less than 2 years ____(2) 2-5 years ____(3) More than 5 years

---

XIV. COLLEGE BOARD ADVANCED PLACEMENT. As the name specifies, we refer to the Advanced Placement of the College Board.

HHHH. How long has your school offered College Board Advanced Placement Courses?
____(1) Less than 5 years ____(2) 5-10 years ____(3) More than 10 years

IIII. In what content areas does your school offer Advanced Placement courses?
____(1) American History ____(2) Art-History ____(3) Biology ____(4) Chemistry
____(5) English Composition/Literature ____(6) English Language/Composition
____(7) European History ____(8) French ____(9) German ____(10) Latin
____(11) Mathematics ____(12) Music ____(13) Physics ____(14) Spanish

JJJJ. How many students completed at least one Advanced Placement course last year? List the number please.
____(1) Sophomores ____(2) Juniors ____(3) Seniors
____(4) Other. Please specify._____

KKKK. How many students took at least one Advanced Placement examination last year? List the number please.
____(1) Sophomores ____(2) Juniors ____(3) Seniors
____(4) Other. Please specify._____

LLLL. What percentage of the examinations received a score of:
____(1) "3" ____(2) "4" ____(3) "5"

MMMM. How were the Advanced Placement opportunities offered?
____(1) Conventional classes ____(2) Independent study
____(3) Seminars ____(4) Correspondence courses
____(4) Other. Please specify._____

XV. FAST PACED COURSES. We define fast paced courses as an arrangement which allows a student to complete two or more courses in a discipline in an abbreviated time span.

NNNN. Last year, how many students were enrolled is such courses in:
____(1) Mathematics ____(2) Foreign language ____(3) Science
____(4) Other. Please specify._____

XVI. CONCURRENT OR DUAL ENROLLMENT. We define concurrent or dual enrollment as an arrangment which allows a student to enroll in classes on two campuses. For example, a middle/junior high student who takes one or moreclasses at the high school or a high school student who takes one or more classes on a college campus.

OOOO. How many students enrolled in classes on two campuses last year? Please specify the numbers.
____(1) Middle/Junior High and Senior High combination
____(2) Middle/Junior High and College combination
____(2) Senior High and College combination

PPPP. Of the number who enrolled in classes at both the middle/junior high and senior high, what percentage satisfactorily completed the class?
____(1) Less than 50% ____(2) 50-75% ____(3) 76-99% ____(4) 100%

QQQQ. Of the number who enrolled in classes at both the middle/junior high and college, what percentage satisfactorily completed the class?
____(1) Less than 50% ____(2) 50-75% ____(3) 76-99% ____(4) 100%

RRRR. Of the number who enrolled in classes at both a senior high school and college, what percentage satisfactorily completed the class?
____(1) Less than 50% ____(2) 50-75% ____(3) 76-99% ____(4) 100%

OTHER. If your school has a provision or program for gifted students not listed in any of the above sections, please describe it briefly.

Thank You!

Dr. Frank P. Belcastro
Dept. of Ed./Psychology
University of Dubuque
Dubuque, Iowa 52001